

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: )  
Barry L. Gregerson et al. ) Examiner: Maria Veronica Ewald  
Serial No.: 10/815,475 )  
Filed: April 1, 2004 )  
For: PLASTIC EMBOSSED CARRIER TAPE ) Date: June 30, 2010  
APPARATUS AND PROCESS :  
VIA EFS FILING

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Notice of Allowance of the United States Patent and Trademark Office mailed April 2, 2010, Applicants submit this "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance".

Applicants respectfully thank the Office for stating claims 1-21, 30-50 and 52-64 are allowed for the reasons stated on pages 2-5 of the Office Action of April 2, 2010 ("Office Action") and as stated, or noted, in previous Office Actions. In indicating its reasons for allowance, Applicants believe the Office interpreted or characterized language in the claims in a manner not previously indicated. For example, in providing reasons for allowance of claims 63 and 64, the Office indicates that the structure of Keim engages a strip after it has exited the guide structure and thus, does not feed the strip through the guide structure. Although Applicants do not necessarily disagree with the Office's statement, Applicants believe that the claim features requiring "a drive assembly adapted

to selectively engage and feed the strip through the guide structure in a sequence of uniform increments" do not necessarily require the drive assembly to engage the strip prior to the strip exiting the guide structure in order to feed the strip through the guide structure. Thus, Applicants submit the allowed subject matter of Applicants' claims should not be limited to the Office's characterization of those claims in the reasons for allowance on pages 2-5 of the Office Action

This Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance is being submitted herewith the Issue Fee. Applicants believe all payments have been submitted; however, if payment is deficient please debit the Deposit Account 50-1660.

Finally, Assignee claims small entity status.

#### Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, Applicants believe that all pending claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Finally, the absence of additional patentability arguments should not be construed as either a disclaimer of such arguments or that such arguments are not believed to be meritorious.

Respectfully Submitted,

/anthony j. Bourget/

By: Anthony J. Bourget  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,753

Bourget Law, S.C.  
Anthony J. Bourget  
1119 Regis Court, Suite 110  
P.O. Box 81  
Eau Claire, WI 54702-0081